



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/540,955	03/31/2000	George H. BuAbbud	560043610132	1921
7590	04/16/2004			EXAMINER LI, SHI K
David B Cochran Jones Day Reavis & Pogue North Point 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114-1190			ART UNIT 2633	PAPER NUMBER 10
DATE MAILED: 04/16/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/540,955	BUABBUD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shi K. Li	2633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3,4,6,7 and 10-21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3,4,6,7 and 10-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 4 recites the limitation "said selected clocking frequency" in lines 1-2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 3-4, 6-7, 10 and 12-20, with the assumption that "selected clocking frequency" reads "first clocking frequency" in claim 4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fellows et al. (U.S. Patent 5,459,607) in view of Neidligner et al. (U.S. Patent 5,491,575) and Kim (U.S. Patent 5,719,904).

Fellows et al. discloses in FIG. 1A and FIG. 1B a digital fiber transmission system comprising a local interface (first location) 2 and a remote location (second location) 4. The local interface transmits a Manchester coded signal having a first clocking frequency to remote location over an optical fiber using a wavelength. The remote location receives the signal and recovers the signal. The remote location converts a NRZ data to Manchester coded of second clock frequency and transmits the second Manchester signal to local interface over the same fiber

Art Unit: 2633

using same wavelength (see col. 1, lines 39-40). Fellows et al. teaches to use 10 MHz for first clock frequency and 200 MHz for second clock frequency (see col. 5, lines 5-9). The local interface receives the second Manchester signal and converts it to NRZ. Regarding claims 3, 7 and 12-20, the difference between Fellows et al. and the claimed invention are (a) Fellows et al. does not transmits NRZ from local interface to remote location and (b) Fellows et al. does not include three (3) pulses for each data bit and use majority voting to determine the value of a received bit.

Neidlanger et al. teaches in FIG. 1 a system for transmitting bi-directional communication data over an optical fiber. Neidlanger et al. teaches to transmit NRZ (baseband) signal in one direction and PSK (equivalent to Manchester) modulated signal in the other direction. This allows the use of high-pass filter and low-pass filter at the receiver side to filter out noise due to crosstalk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Neidlanger et al. with the digital fiber transmission system of Fellows et al. because NRZ (baseband) signal and high speed Manchester signal have very little overlap in frequency spectrum and the approach of Neidlanger et al. further reduces crosstalk between signals of different directions. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit NRZ from local interface to remote location, as taught by Neidlanger et al., in the digital fiber transmission system of Fellows et al. because crosstalk between NRZ and high frequency Manchester is small.

Majority voting is a well-known simple error correction mechanism. Kim teaches in col. 1, lines 43-51 the basic concept of majority voting. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Kim with the modified bi-directional communication

system of Fellows et al. and Neidlinger et al. because majority voting is a simple method for reducing errors. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use majority voting method, as taught by Kim, in the modified bi-directional communication system of Fellows et al. and Neidlinger et al. because majority voting is a simple method for reducing errors.

Regarding claim 4, Fellows et al. teaches a first clocking frequency of 10 MHz and Neidlinger et al. teaches a first clocking frequency of 70 MHz (see col. 4, lines 50-51 of Neidlinger et al.). It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose any frequency in the range 10 MHz~70 MHz, e.g., 25 MHz, in the modified bi-directional communication system of Fellows et al., Neidlinger et al. and Kim.

Regarding claims 6 and 10, Neidlinger et al. includes low pass filter TP in the central station and low pass filter LP in the decentralized station.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fellows et al., Neidlinger et al. and Kim as applied to claims 3-4, 6-7, 10 and 12-20 above, and further in view of Watanabe (U.S. Patent 5,896,211).

Fellows et al., Neidlinger et al. and Kim have been discussed above in regard to claims 3-4, 6-7, 10 and 12-20 above. Neidlinger et al. includes high pass filter in the second station between the modulator and the laser diode and band-pass filter BP in the first station between the photodiode and the discriminator. The difference between the modified communication system and method of Fellows et al., Neidlinger et al. and Kim and the claimed invention is that Neidlinger et al. uses high pass filter in the second station while the claimed invention uses band pass filter. Watanabe teaches in FIG. 10 the use of band pass filter after the modulation. It is well

known in the art that the spectrum of a modulated signal is practically band limited. Using a band pass filter blocks noise outside the signal spectrum. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a band pass filter instead of the high pass filter, as taught by Watanabe, in the modified communication system and method of Fellows et al., Neidlenger et al. and Kim because a band pass filter blocks noise outside the signal spectrum.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fellows et al. (U.S. Patent 5,459,607) in view of Neidlenger et al. (U.S. Patent 5,491,575).

Fellows et al. discloses in FIG. 1A and FIG. 1B a digital fiber transmission system comprising a local interface (first location) 2 and a remote location (second location) 4. The local interface transmits a Manchester coded signal having a first clocking frequency to remote location over an optical fiber using a wavelength. The remote location receives the signal and recovers the signal. The remote location converts a NRZ data to Manchester coded of second clock frequency and transmits the second Manchester signal to local interface over the same fiber using same wavelength (see col. 1, lines 39-40). Fellows et al. teaches to use 10 MHz for first clock frequency and 200 MHz for second clock frequency (see col. 5, lines 5-9). The local interface receives the second Manchester signal and converts it to NRZ. The difference between Fellows and the claimed invention is that Fellows et al. does not transmits NRZ from local interface to remote location.

Neidlenger et al. teaches in FIG. 1 a system for transmitting bi-directional communication data over an optical fiber. Neidlenger et al. teaches to transmit NRZ (baseband) signal in one direction and PSK (equivalent to Manchester) modulated signal in the other direction. This

allows the use of high-pass filter and low-pass filter at the receiver side to filter out noise due to crosstalk. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to combine the teaching of Neidlinger et al. with the digital fiber transmission system of Fellows et al. because NRZ (baseband) signal and high speed Manchester signal have very little overlap in frequency spectrum and the approach of Neidlinger et al. further reduces crosstalk between signals of different directions. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit NRZ from local interface to remote location, as taught by Neidlinger et al., in the digital fiber transmission system of Fellows et al. because crosstalk between NRZ and high frequency Manchester is small.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-4, 6-7 and 10-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shi K. Li whose telephone number is 703 305-4341. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on 703 305-4729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

skl



JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600